Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/808,706	MCMILLAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n:
(1) Juliet C. Switzer.	(3)	
(2) <u>Chun-Pok Leung</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>11 November 2003</u>	Time: afternoon	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	oplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 30-51 Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHA	TWAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sun 	 The examiner will provide a rate record of the substance 	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appl	icant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted that the newly added claims depend from method claims, but recite in the preamble "The apparatus of claim 29." The examiner inquired as to whether applicant intended to claim a method or an apparatus. Mr. Leung indicated that the use of the word "apparatus" was a typo, and that the intent of the claims was to be drawn to method claims. It was agreed that the examiner would set forth a 112 2nd rejection for lack of antecedent basis of the claims since claim 29 does not include an apparatus, but in the interest of compact prosecution would examine the claims with regard to the method limitaitons.